
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: ÉVALUATION DES PRATIQUES PHYTOSANITAIRES PAYSANNES DANS LES VERGERS DE CACAO EN CÔTE D'IVOIRE : CAS DU DÉPARTEMENT DE DALOA (CENTRE - OUEST, CÔTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0871/18	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title is too long, several words can be removed. It can be stated as: ÉVALUATION DES PRATIQUES PHYTOSANITAIRES PAYSANNES DANS LES VERGERS DE CACAO DANS LE DÉPARTEMENT DE DALOA, CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstracts in French as well as in English contain the necessary information but should be rewrite by removing all the parts in yellow	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Few grammatical errors; I corrected some of them (in red) other (in yellow) should be corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Need some corrections	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Ok but need some corrections	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Need to take into account all the suggestions I have made.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper can be published but the authors should take into account the recommendation in the text (yellow) and in the revision marks

